

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS

California Rules of Court, rule 8.1115(a), prohibits courts and parties from citing or relying on opinions not certified for publication or ordered published, except as specified by rule 8.1115(b). This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.111.5.
--

IN THE COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
SECOND APPELLATE DISTRICT
DIVISION SIX

THE PEOPLE,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

DENTRAY WHITE,

Defendant and Appellant.

2d Crim. No. B217744
(Super. Ct. No. F419005)
(San Luis Obispo County)

Dentray White appeals the judgment of conviction following a plea of no contest to possession of concentrated cannabis. (Health & Saf. Code, § 11357, subd. (a).) The trial court sentenced appellant to a low term of 16 months, to run consecutive to a 17 year prison term appellant was serving. Appellant was ordered to pay to pay a \$400 restitution fine (Pen. Code, § 1202.4, subd. (b))¹ and a \$400 parole revocation fine (§ 1202.45).

We appointed counsel to represent appellant in this appeal. After counsel's examination of the record, he filed an opening brief in which no issues were raised.

On October 26, 2009, we advised appellant that he had 30 days within which to personally submit any contentions or issues he wished us to consider. We have received no response from appellant.

¹ All statutory references are to the Penal Code unless otherwise stated.

The preliminary hearing transcript indicates that marijuana was found in appellant's cell at the California Men's Colony on January 2, 2008, and January 3, 2008. After an amended information was filed, appellant pled no contest to possession of concentrated cannabis in exchange for a 16 month sentence to run consecutive to the prison term appellant was serving. Pursuant to the negotiated plea, the trial court dismissed a count for possession marijuana for sale (Health & Saf. Code, § 11359), a count for possession of marijuana in a jail facility (§ 4573.6) and struck four prior strike enhancements (§§ 667, subds. (d)-(e); 1170.12, subds. (b) –(c)).

We have examined the entire record and are satisfied that appellant's attorney has fully complied with his responsibilities and that no arguable issues exist. (*People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436, 441; *People v. Kelly*, *supra*, 40 Cal.4th at p. 126.)

The judgment is affirmed.

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED.

YEGAN, Acting P.J.

We concur:

COFFEE, J.

PERREN, J.

Charles S. Crandall, Judge
Superior Court County of San Luis Obispo

California Appellate Project, under appointment by the Court of Appeal,
for Defendant and Appellant.

No appearance for Respondent.